# TITLE II PROJECT APPLICATION ROSEBURG DISTRICT RESOURCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

1. Project Number (Assigned by federal unit):\_\_\_\_\_

| 2. Project Name: Jack Creek Culvert Replacements   | 3. County: Douglas  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| 4. Project Sponsor: Roseburg UBWC, Bob Kinyon 5. Date: February 1, 2002  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| <b>6. Sponsor's Phone Number:</b> (541) 673-5756   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7. Sponsors E-mail: bkinyon@rosenet.net  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | J   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8. Project Location (attach project area map)  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| a. 4 <sup>th</sup> Field Watershed Name and HUC #(if known): 17100303  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| b. 5 <sup>th</sup> Field Watershed Name and HUC #(if known): Elk Creek, 17100.   | 30303   |  |  |  |  |  |
| c. Legal Location: Township <u>21S</u> Range <u>6W</u> Section(s) <u>35</u> (See map   | for more details)   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Township <u>22S</u> Range <u>6W</u> Section(s) <u>2</u>  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Township Range Section(s)  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Township Range Section(s)  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Description:   | C: C  |  |  |  |  |  |
| d. BLM District Roseburge. BLM Resource Af. National Forestg. Forest Service Di  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| f. National Forest g. Forest Service Di h. State / Private / Other lands involved? Yes No  | strict  |  |  |  |  |  |
| n. State / Private / Other lands involved / Yes \( \square \) No   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9. Statement of Project Goals and Objectives:  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Restore fish passage for both juvenile and adult fish to 3 miles of essential spawning and rearing habitat in Jack Creek.  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Meet Oregon water quality standards for sediment by reducing the   | ne risk of a major culvert failure.   |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Replace two existing old culvert with bridges constructed from s   | urplus rail road flat cars.   |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| <b>10. Project Description:</b> (Provide concise description of project and attach n   | nap.)   |  |  |  |  |  |
| The Umpqua Basin Watershed Council (UBWC) is coordinating old culverts with new railroad flatcar bridges. The culverts are a and steelhead migration and a complete barrier to juvenile migration both upstream and downstream passage for juvenile and adult fis culverts are at risk of completely failing and putting a large amount culverts are on private land owned by Woolley Enterprises, Inc. implement sheds, a tree farm, and managed forest lands. The BL drainage upstream of the proposed project area. | partial barrier to adult coho, chinook, tion. The new bridges would allow the to Jack Creek. In addition, the ant of sediment into the stream. The The roads are used for access to |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11. Coordination of this project with other related project(s)   | on adjacent lands?  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yes No If yes, then describe   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| The UBWC is coordinating this project on private land.   |   |  |  |  |  |  |

## TITLE II PROJECT APPLICATION ROSEBURG DISTRICT RESOURCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

| 12. How does proposed project meet purposes of the Legislation? [Sec. 203(b)(1)] |   |  |  |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| ☐ Improves maintenance of existing infrastructure. [Sec. 2(b)]                   |   |  |  |  |  |
| Implements stewardship objectives that enhance forest ecosystems. [Sec. 2(b)]    |   |  |  |  |  |
| Restores and improves land health. [Sec. 2(b)]                                   |   |  |  |  |  |
| Restores water quality. [Sec. 2(b)]  |   |  |  |  |  |
| <u> </u>   |   |  |  |  |  |
|  |   |  |  |  |  |
| <b>13. Project Type</b> (check one) [Sec. 203(b)(1)]                             |   |  |  |  |  |
| Road Maintenance [Sec. 2(b)(2)(A)]   | Trail Maintenance [Sec. 2(b)(2)(A)]                 |  |  |  |  |
| Road Decommission/Obliteration [Sec. 2(b)(2)(A)]                                 | Trail Obliteration [Sec. 2(b)(2)(A)]                |  |  |  |  |
| Other Infrastructure Maintenance (specify): [Sec. 2(b)(2)(A)]                    |   |  |  |  |  |
| Soil Productivity Improvement [Sec. 2(b)(2)(B)]                                  | Forest Health Improvement [Sec. 2(b)(2)(C)]         |  |  |  |  |
| Watershed Restoration & Mntc. [Sec. 2(b)(2)(D)]                                  | Wildlife Habitat Restoration [Sec. 2(b)(2)(E)]      |  |  |  |  |
| Fish Habitat Restoration [Sec. 2(b)(2)(E)]                                       | Control of Noxious Weeds [Sec. 2(b)(2)(F)]          |  |  |  |  |
| Reestablish Native Species [Sec. 2(b)(2)(G)]                                     |   |  |  |  |  |
| Other Project Type (specify) [Sec. 2(b)(2)]:                                     |   |  |  |  |  |
|  |   |  |  |  |  |
|  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 14. Measure of Project Accomplishments/Expected Outcomes [Sec. 203(b)(5)]        |   |  |  |  |  |
| a. Total Acres: N/A  | b. Total Miles: Restores 2.4 miles of fish habitat. |  |  |  |  |
| c. No. Structures: 2   | d. Est. People Reached                              |  |  |  |  |
| e. No. Laborer Days: 5   | (for environmental education projects): N/A         |  |  |  |  |
| f. Other (specify):  |   |  |  |  |  |

**15.** Duration of Project and Estimated Completion Date: [Sec. 203(b)(2)] **06/01 – 06/02:** Planning; **07/02 – 09/02:** Implementation

**16. Target Species Benefited:** (if applicable) Coho Salmon, Chinook, Steelhead and Cutthroat Trout are present during all or part of the year. Coho Salmon is currently listed under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) as a threatened species, and Steelhead are a candidate species for listing.

17. How will cooperative relationships among people that use federal lands be improved? [Sec. 2(b)(3)]

The project will allow the multiple participants—which include the Umpqua Basin Watershed Council, the Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board, the Land Owner, and the US Fish and Wildlife Service—in this project to strengthen their relationships with each other.

18. How is this project in the best public interest? [Sec. 203(b)(7)] Identify benefits to communities.

Culvert replacements will restore access to spawning gravels and rearing habitat, which are blocked by the existing culverts. This project would also benefit the local community by providing jobs during the construction work.

## TITLE II PROJECT APPLICATION ROSEBURG DISTRICT RESOURCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

### 19. How does project benefit federal lands/resources?

This project would restore fish passage, allowing anadromous fish to access the upper portion of Jack Creek, which is on BLM land and listed as Essential Salmon Habitat by the National Marine Fisheries Service. In addition, this project would help reduce the risk of a culvert failure which would cause sediment levels to exceed Oregon State water quality standards as required by federal law. If one or both of the culverts were to fail a large amount of sediment would enter into Jack and eventually Elk Creek.

| 20. Status of Project Planning   |                       |               |                      |  |  |  |
|--|-----------------------|---------------|----------------------|--|--|--|
| a. NEPA Complete:  | Yes                   | No No         |                      |  |  |  |
| If no, give est. date of completion: 06/02   |                       |               |                      |  |  |  |
| c. NMFS Sec. 7 ESA Consultation Complete:  | ⊠ Yes                 | ☐ No          |                      |  |  |  |
| d. USFWS Sec. 7 ESA Consultation Complete:   | ⊠ Yes                 | ☐ No          |                      |  |  |  |
| e. Survey & Manage Complete:   | ☐ Yes                 | ☐ No          |                      |  |  |  |
| f. DSL/ODFW* Permits for In-stream Work Obtained:  | ☐ Yes                 | ⊠ No          | Not Applicable       |  |  |  |
| g. DSL/COE* 404 Fill/Removal Permit Obtained:  | ☐ Yes                 | ☐ No          |                      |  |  |  |
| h. SHPO* Concurrence Received:   | ☐ Yes                 | ☐ No          | Not Applicable       |  |  |  |
| i. Project Design(s) Completed:  | ⊠ Yes                 | □ No          |                      |  |  |  |
| * DSL = Dept. of State Lands, ODFW = Oregon Dept. of Fish<br>State Historic Preservation Officer | h and Wildlife, COE = | Army Corps    | of Engineers, SHPO = |  |  |  |
|  |                       |               |                      |  |  |  |
|  |                       |               |                      |  |  |  |
| 21. Proposed Method(s) of Accomplishment   |                       |               |                      |  |  |  |
|  | ☐ Federal Workforce   |               |                      |  |  |  |
| County Workforce   | Volunteers            |               |                      |  |  |  |
| Other (specify): The UBWC will coordinate the proj   | ect and administer of | ontracts.     |                      |  |  |  |
|  |                       |               |                      |  |  |  |
|  |                       |               |                      |  |  |  |
| 22. Will the Project Generate Merchantable Materials? [Sec. 204(e)(3)]                           |                       |               |                      |  |  |  |
| ☐ Yes  |                       |               |                      |  |  |  |
| 23. Anticipated Project Costs [Sec. 203(b)(3)]   |                       |               |                      |  |  |  |
| a. Total County Title II Funds Requested: \$14,435   |                       |               |                      |  |  |  |
| b. Is this a multi-year funding request? Yes No  | If yes, then displa   | v by fiscal v | <i>y</i> ear         |  |  |  |
| c. FY02 Request:   |                       |               |                      |  |  |  |
| d. FY03 Request:   | g. FY06 Request:      |               |                      |  |  |  |
| e FVM Request:   |                       |               |                      |  |  |  |

## TITLE II PROJECT APPLICATION ROSEBURG DISTRICT RESOURCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

**Table 1. Project Cost Analysis** 

| Item   | Column A Fed. Agency Appropriated Contribution [Sec. 203(b)(4)] | Column B Requested County Title II Contribution [Sec. 203(b)(4)] | Column C Other Contributions [Sec. 203(b)(4)] | Column D<br>Total<br>Available<br>Funds |
|--|---|--|---|---|
| 24. Field Work & Site Surveys                                    |   |  |   |   |
| 25. NEPA & Sec. 7 ESA Consultation                               |   | \$6,000  |   | \$6,000                                 |
| 26. Permit Acquisition   |   |  |   |   |
| 27. Project Design & Engineering                                 | \$0   | \$680  | \$680   | \$1,360                                 |
| 28. Contract Preparation   |   |  |   |   |
| 29. Contract Administration                                      |   |  |   |   |
| 30. Contract Cost  | \$0   | \$7,000  | \$49,000                                      | \$56,000                                |
| 31. Workforce Cost   |   | ,  | \$4,675                                       | \$4,675                                 |
| 32. Materials & Supplies   |   |  |   |   |
| 33. Monitoring   | \$0   | \$0  | \$750   | \$750                                   |
| 34. Other  |   |  |   |   |
| 35. Project Sub-Total  |   |  |   |   |
| 36. Indirect Costs (Overhead) (per year for multi-year projects) | \$0   | \$755  | \$4,007                                       | \$4,762                                 |
| 37. Total Cost Estimate  | \$0   | \$14,435   | \$59,112                                      | \$73,547                                |

- 38. Identify Source(s) of Other Funding for Project Identified Above [Sec. 203(b)(4)]
  - o The Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board
  - The land owner
  - o Umpqua Fisherman's Enhancement Derby
  - The US Fish and Wildlife Service

The UBWC will coordinate the project and administer all contracts.

#### **39. Monitoring Plan** [Sec. 203(b)(6)]

a. What measures or evaluations will be made to determine how well the proposed project meets the desired ecological conditions? [Sec. 203(b)(6)] Who will be responsible for this monitoring item?

All new structures and improvements will be monitored during and after construction to ensure that they were constructed to minimize the diversion of natural hydrologic flow paths, reduce the amount of sediment delivery into stream, protect fish and wildlife populations, and accommodate a 100-year flood. A representative from the UBWC will be responsible for monitoring water quality during the contract and an ODF&W biologist will monitor the project for five years after the contract is completed to ensure that fish are able to pass through the new structures.

## TITLE II PROJECT APPLICATION ROSEBURG DISTRICT RESOURCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

b. How will the project be evaluated to determine how well the proposed project contributes towards local employment and/or training opportunities, including summer youth jobs programs such as the Youth Conservation Corps? [Sec. 203(b)(6)] Who will be responsible for this monitoring item?

Project implementation will be completed via contracts with local companies. The Contracting Officer will report the number of person days used to complete this project. No further evaluation is planned.

c. What methods and measures of evaluation will be established to determine how well the proposed project improves the use of, or added value to, any products removed from federal lands consistent with the purposes of this Act? [Sec. 203(b)(6) and Sec. 204(e)(3)] Who will be responsible for this monitoring item?

This project will not remove any merchantable materials.

d. Identify total funding needed to carry out specified monitoring tasks (Table 1, item 33):

\$750 (See Table 1, project cost analysis)